

REMARKS

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant confirms the Examiner's suspicion that an Information Disclosure Statement, filed Jan. 31, 2002, was not filed by applicant. However, with the present Amendment, applicant is concurrently submitting an Information Disclosure Statement for consideration by the Examiner.

Drawing Objections

The enclosed replacement drawing sheets are in response to objections of the PTO-948, Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review. Applicant appreciates the waiver, by the Chief Draftsperson, of the initial PTO-948 objection to the non-sequential numbering of the views of Figure 8. Specifically, applicant did not produce a view labeled "8O," but followed view 8N by a view labeled 8P, in order to avoid potential confusion of a view labeled "8O" with the number eighty (i.e. "80"). Applicant respectfully submits that all drawing objections have been traversed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112 ¶ 2

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, 10-12 for lacking certain antecedent basis. The claims as amended to provide such antecedent basis and applicant respectfully submits that all 35 USC § 112 ¶ 2 rejections have been traversed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 as anticipated by Lin, cited by the Examiner in his Form PTO-892. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended, for at least the following reasons, traverses the Examiner's rejections.

First, claim 1 covers the production of a CCFG that has been both augmented with data edges and scheduled. No such scheduled augmented CCFG is produced or suggested by the approach of Lin.

Second, claim 1 covers the production of a first context switch in the SCFG based on the condition of a first thread of a first node of the scheduled augmented CCFG. No such conditional basis for the production of the SCFG is taught or suggested by Lin, which relies instead upon the production of a Petri net representation.

Since claims 2-9 are dependent on claim 1, claims 2-9 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Since claims 10-12 are similar to claim 1, with the exception of their being in data processing system, computer program product and computer data signal form, such claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Commissioner for Patents  
App. No. 09/477,688  
July 7, 2003  
Page 7 of 7

Applicant respectfully submits that all 35 USC § 102 rejections have been traversed and requests a Notice of Allowance.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2584 referencing docket number 06816.0005.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan T. Kaplan  
Registration No. 38,935

Date: July 7, 2003

**JONATHAN T. KAPLAN**  
**ATTORNEY AT LAW**  
**140 NASSAU STREET**  
**NEW YORK, NY 10038-1501**  
**TEL. 917-674-5017**